



ATTORNEY DOCKET: 76109.01001  
PATENT

**THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re: Patent application of :  
John I. Ykema :  
Serial No.: 09/213,099 : **Group Art Unit: 2112**  
Filed: December 17, 1998 : **Examiner: Tim T. Vo**  
For: **POWER NODE CONTROL CENTER** :

Charles N. Quinn  
Registration No. 27,223  
Customer No. 34661  
Fox Rothschild LLP  
2000 Market Street, 10th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA., 19103-3291  
215-299-2135  
215-299-2150 (fax)  
cquinn@foxrothschild.com  
Deposit Account 50-1943

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO 24 FEBRUARY 2005 PAPER**

Sir:

**Introductory Comments**

This is submitted in response to an official action bearing a mailing date of 24 February 2005 in which the examiner noted that claims 1 through 24, 35, 52 through 74 and 80 through 93 were allowed and that claims 25 through 34, 36 through 51 and 75

through 79 were subject to a restriction or election requirement. The examiner further noted that the drawings filed on 21 January 1999 were acceptable. The action was non-final.

As respecting claims 25 through 34, 36 through 51 and 75 through 79 and the restriction requirement relating thereto, applicant traverses the restriction requirement in all of its respects and requests reconsideration. In that regard, applicant believes there is a typographical error in the restriction requirement since the examiner on the page entitled "Office Action Summary" indicates claims 1 through 24 to be allowed and claims 25 through 34 (among others) to be subject to a restriction or election requirement. However, on page 2 under the heading "Detailed Action" and under the subheading "Elections/Restrictions" the examiner states that claims 1 through 25 (of which all but claim 25 are indicated as "allowed"—see the previous sentence) are one of the allegedly distinct restricted groups of claims, purportedly being drawn to an electrical modular power node classified in class 700, subclass 286.

Applicant respectfully requests clarification as to whether claim 25 has been allowed and/or is subject to a restriction or election requirement. The two pages of the official action, one entitled "Office Action Summary" and the other entitled "Detailed Action" seem to be inconsistent one with another.